

Comments on Proposed Plans for Quendall Terminals Superfund Site

Comments here

My primary concern is that the clean-up process does not in any way diminish the quality of the lake water during the clean-up or after. No development economic interest should overwhelm the greater Seattle area public interest in clean water for now and future generations of people and wildlife.

I support the plan that most effectively plan for protecting the water and the public resource ^{that is} of Lake Washington.

This pollution has been here for many, many decades. The time to effectively clean up this site should not be a factor. If it takes 2 decades that is a blink of the eye in the lifetime of the lake and the generations of people, fish and animals who enjoy Lake Washington and its waters.

Please continue on the back or attach pages if needed.

Name: (b) (6)
Affiliation: Neighbor of the site
Address: (b) (6)
City, State, Zip: Renton WA 98056

Ways to submit your comments:

- Drop your comments in the box during today's Open House and Public Meeting
- Present oral comments during today's Public Meeting
- Email comments to: cerise.kathryn@epa.gov
- Send written comments by mail to:
Quendall Terminals Comments
Kathryn Cerise, 12-D12-1
U.S. EPA Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 155
Seattle, WA 98101

The deadline for submitting comments is October 9, 2019

Comments on Proposed Plans for Quendall Terminals Superfund Site

Comments here

I want this property to be cleaned up and made into a public park. Please. Thank you.

Please continue on the back or attach pages if needed.

Name: (b) (6)
Affiliation: (b) (6)
Address: (b) (6)
City, State, Zip: Renton WA 98059

Ways to submit your comments:

- Drop your comments in the box during today's Open House and Public Meeting
- Present oral comments during today's Public Meeting
- Email comments to: cerise.kathryn@epa.gov
- Send written comments by mail to:
Quendall Terminals Comments
Kathryn Cerise, 12-D12-1
U.S. EPA Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 155
Seattle, WA 98101

The deadline for submitting comments is October 9, 2019

Comments of (b) (6)

Submitted in writing at EPA presentation on September 24, 2019

(b) (6) that owns Altino Properties, Inc., one of the two companies that are the owners of the Quendall Terminals property. (b) (6)

(b) (6) that has been trying to clean up the Quendall Terminals property and restore it to productive use, even though our family did not cause the contamination.

I urge EPA to reconsider its preferred alternative. EPA's preferred alternative is wrong for many reasons:

- Cost. EPA's preferred alternative will cost three times the amount of other EPA-approved alternatives, exceeding the value of the property and making redevelopment difficult if not impossible.
- Time. EPA's preferred alternative will take too long to implement, which will delay and potentially imperil the redevelopment of the property. The development plans for the property have been approved by the City of Renton, but time is of the essence because the right to develop the site will expire if the site is not cleaned up and 51 percent occupied by 2027.
- Risky and Unproven Technology. EPA's preferred alternative relies on a risky and unproven technology (STAR), when better cleanup options are available and are just as protective of human health and the environment.
- Uncertainty. The extra cost and time associated with the unproven STAR technology creates a level of uncertainty that will make it difficult to attract a developer willing to undertake the remediation of the site.
- Imperils Redevelopment. The cleanup of the site cannot be funded without the redevelopment of the property. EPA's preferred alternative will stymie redevelopment because its alternative is too expensive, too uncertain as to cost and schedule, and doesn't offer any flexibility to a developer.
- Other Better Alternatives. In choosing its preferred alternative, EPA focused only on alternatives that EPA asserts could possibly restore groundwater to drinking water standards. However, even with the most aggressive and expensive cleanup, EPA estimates that groundwater would never be cleaned up to drinking level standards. EPA's preferred alternative, therefore, incorporates a goal for groundwater that is unrealistic no matter how much money is spent. There are other remedies with respect to groundwater that are protective of human health and the environment but that don't require that groundwater be restored to drinking water standards.

EPA acknowledges that there are cleanup alternatives costing less than half as much that are protective of human health and the environment. I urge EPA to reconsider those alternatives in place of its preferred alternative, so that the site can be cleaned up and redeveloped in a reasonable timeframe.

(b) (6)

Kirkland, WA 98033